

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
11 **SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

12 MICHAEL PEMBERTON, et al.,
13 Plaintiffs,
14

15 v.

16 NATIONSTAR MORTGAGE LLC,
17 Defendant.
18

Case No. 14-cv-1024-BAS (WVG)

**ORDER GRANTING IN PART
JOINT MOTION FOR PARTIES
TO EXCEED PAGE LIMITS**

19 On June 5, 2014, Defendant Nationstar Mortgage LLC filed a Motion to
20 Dismiss (Doc. 11). On June 27, 2014, the parties filed a joint motion to exceed the
21 page limits, averring that the complex issues in this case required an extra five
22 pages of briefing over the limitations imposed in Civil Local Rule 7.1(h).

23 It is “well established” that “[d]istrict courts have inherent power to control
24 their dockets.” *Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Ry. Co. v. Hercules Inc.*, 146 F.3d
25 1071, 1074 (9th Cir.1998). The parties have not provided compelling rationale
26 requiring excess pages to address the relevant issues. Issues involving lengthy and
27 detailed factual or legal discussions are routinely briefed within the page limit
28 imposed in Civil Local Rule 7.1(h). However, the Court will nonetheless exercise

1 its discretion and grant the parties leave to exceed the page limitation imposed by
2 Civil Local Rule 7.1(h).


3 Accordingly, the Court **GRANTS** the parties' motion. The parties' page
4 limitations for their briefs are as follows:

5 (2) Plaintiffs' opposition shall not exceed **30 pages** in length; and

6 (3) Defendants' reply shall not exceed **15 pages** in length.

7 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

8
9 **DATED: June 30, 2014**


10 **Hon. Cynthia Bashant**
11 **United States District Judge**